A cell-centred finite volume approximation for second order partial derivative operators with full matrix on unstructured meshes in any space dimension

Robert Eymard, Thierry Gallouët, Raphaèle Herbin

A cell-centered finite volume approximation for second order partial derivative operators with full matrix on unstructured meshes in any space dimension

R. Eymard*, T. Gallouët† and R. Herbin‡

May 6, 2005

Abstract. Finite volume methods for problems involving second order operators with full diffusion matrix can be used thanks to the definition of a discrete gradient for piecewise constant functions on unstructured meshes satisfying an orthogonality condition. This discrete gradient is shown to satisfy a strong convergence property on the interpolation of regular functions, and a weak one on functions bounded for a discrete H^1 norm. To highlight the importance of both properties, the convergence of the finite volume scheme on a homogeneous Dirichlet problem with full diffusion matrix is proven, and an error estimate is provided. Numerical tests show the actual accuracy of the method.

Keywords. anisotropic diffusion, finite volume methods, discrete gradient, convergence analysis

1 Introduction

The approximation of convection diffusion problems in anisotropic media is an important issue in several engineering fields. Let us briefly review four particular situations where the discretization of a nondiagonal second order operator is required:

1. In the case of a contaminant transported by a one-phase flow, one must account for the diffusion-dispersion operator $\mathrm{div}(\Lambda \nabla u)$, where the matrix $\Lambda(x) = \lambda(x)\mathrm{I}_d + \mu(x)\mathbf{q}(x) \cdot \mathbf{q}(x)^t$ depends on the space variable x and $\mathbf{q}(x)$ is the velocity of the fluid flow in the porous medium. The real parameter $\lambda(x)$ corresponds to a resulting isotropic diffusion term, including dispersion in the directions orthogonal to the flow, and the real parameter $\mu(x)$ to an additional diffusion in the direction of the flow [5]. The term $\mathbf{q}(x)$ is then given by $\mathbf{q}(x) = K(x)\nabla p(x)$, where $p(x)$ is a pressure and $K(x)$ another nondiagonal matrix (the absolute permeability matrix, depending on the geological layers), and satisfies the incompressibility equation $\mathrm{div}\mathbf{q}(x) = 0$. In this coupled problem, one must simultaneously compute this pressure and the contaminant concentration $u(x)$.

2. In the study of undersaturated flows in porous media (for example, air-water flows), two equations of conservation have to be solved, associated with two unknowns, pressure and

*Université de Marne-la-Vallée, France, eymard@math.univ-mlv.fr
†Université de Provence, France, gallouet@cmi.univ-mrs.fr
‡Université de Provence, France, herbin@cmi.univ-mrs.fr

saturation. These equations include nonlinear hyperbolic and degenerate parabolic terms with respect to the saturation unknown. As in the preceding case, one must discretize such terms as $\text{div}\mathbf{q}(x) = \text{div}(K(x)\nabla p(x))$, where again $K(x)$ is a nondiagonal matrix depending on the geological layers.

3. In the case of the compressible Navier-Stokes equations, one has to discretize the viscous forces operator, which can be written under the form $a\Delta\mathbf{u} + b\nabla\text{div}\mathbf{u}$ (a and b are deduced from the dynamic viscosity coefficients and $\mathbf{u}$ is the fluid velocity). In this problem, the term $\nabla\text{div}\mathbf{u}$ involves all the cross derivatives $\partial^2_{ij}\mathbf{u}$.

4. Some problems arising in financial mathematics lead to anisotropic diffusion equations in high-dimensional domains (dimension equal to 5 or more for example). Under some assumptions on financial markets [23], the price of a European or an American option is obtained by solving a linear or nonlinear partial differential equation, involving the second order anisotropic diffusion matrix $\Lambda = \Sigma\Sigma^t$, where Σ is a real matrix.

All these cases involve a term under the form $\text{div}(\Lambda\nabla u)$, where Λ is a (generally) nondiagonal matrix depending on the space variable and u is a function of the space variable in steady problems, and of the space and time variables in transient problems. Finite element schemes are known to allow for an easy discretization of such a term on triangular or tetrahedral meshes [27]. However, in engineering situations such as the ones described above, one also has to discretize convection and reaction terms, and avoid numerical instabilities. Unfortunately, finite element methods (and more generally centered schemes) are known to generate instabilities on coarse grids, although some cures may be proposed, see [14, 3]; therefore a great many numerical codes [1, 2, 14, 21, 22] use finite volume or finite volume - finite element type schemes, which allow the implementation of discretization techniques (such as the classical upwind schemes) which prevent the apparition of instabilities. Let us also note that finite volume schemes are known for their simplicity of implementation, particularly so when discretizing coupled systems of equations of various nature.

Besides, a thorough mathematical analysis has now been improved, showing that finite volume methods are well suited and convergent for a simple convection diffusion equation in the case where $\Lambda(x) = \lambda(x)\ \mathrm{I}_d$. Indeed, this analysis has been completed (see [17], [24], [16], [8]) in the case of grids (called admissible in the sense of [8], see also Definition 2.1 below) satisfying an orthogonality condition: the line joining two cell centers is orthogonal to the interface between the two cells, thus ensuring a consistency property when approximating the normal flux at the cell interface by centered finite differences. Some examples of such admissible grids are the Delaunay triangular meshes or tetrahedral meshes, rectangular or parallelepipedic meshes in 2 or 3 dimensions, and the Voronoï meshes in any dimension.

But the situation is quite different in the case where the condition $\Lambda(x) = \lambda(x)\ \mathrm{I}_d$ no longer holds: only few of the actual discretization methods used for handling nondiagonal second order terms on finite volume grids meet a full mathematical analysis of stability or convergence. Let us briefly review some of them. A first one, in the case where $\Lambda(x) = \lambda(x)\ M$, where M is a symmetric positive definite matrix, consists in adapting the above orthogonality condition by stating that the line joining two cell centers is orthogonal to the interface between the two cells with respect to the dot product induced by the matrix Λ^{-1}. Indeed, it is also possible to consider the case where M depends on the discretization cell, by using, in each cell, the orthogonal bisectors for the metric induced by M^{-1} (see [18] and [8] section 11 page 815). In the case of triangular grids, this yields a well defined scheme under some restriction on the allowed anisotropy for a given geometry, since the cell center is chosen as the intersection of the orthogonal bisectors of the triangle for the metric defined by M^{-1}. Another method consists in defining the finite volume method as a dual method to a finite element one (for example, a P1 finite element [5] or a Crouzeix-Raviart one, see e.g. [13]).

Another possibility to derive a finite volume scheme on problems including anisotropic diffusion is to construct a local discrete gradient, allowing to get, at each edge σ of the mesh, a consistent approximate value for the flux $\int_\sigma (\Lambda(x)\nabla u(x))\cdot \mathbf{n}_\sigma \mathrm{d}\gamma(x)$ involved in the finite volume scheme ($\mathbf{n}_\sigma$ is a unit vector normal to the edge σ, and $\mathrm{d}\gamma(x)$ is the $d-1$ Lebesgue measure on the edge σ). In two space dimensions, such a scheme was introduced in [6] on arbitrary meshes, but the proof of convergence was only possible on meshes close to parallelograms. Still in 2D, a technique using dual meshes is introduced in [19, 7], which generalizes the idea of [25, 20] for div-curl problems to meshes with no orthogonality conditions; however the use of a dual mesh renders the scheme computationally expensive; moreover it does not seem to be easily extended to 3D. In [10], we used Raviart-Thomas shape functions, generalized to the case of any admissible mesh (again in the sense precised of [8], see also Definition 2.1 below), in order to define a discrete gradient for piecewise constant functions. The strong convergence of this discrete gradient was then shown in the case of the elliptic equation $-\Delta u = f$. A drawback of this definition was the difficulty to find an approximation of these generalized shape functions in other cases than triangles or rectangles.

We therefore propose in this paper a new cheap and simple method of constructing a discrete gradient for a piecewise constant function, on arbitrary admissible meshes in any space dimension (this method has been first introduced in [11]). We prove that the discrete gradients of any sequence of piecewise constant functions converging to some $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ weakly converges to ∇u in $L^2(\Omega)$. Moreover, the discrete gradient is shown to be consistent, in the sense that it satisfies a strong convergence property on the interpolation of regular function. In order to show the efficiency of this approximation method, we use this discrete gradient to design a scheme for the approximation of the weak solution $\bar{u}$ of the following diffusion problem with full anisotropic tensor:

$$\begin{aligned} &-\mathrm{div}(\Lambda\nabla\bar{u}) = f \text{ in } \Omega,\\ &\bar{u} = 0 \text{ on } \partial\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

under the following assumptions:

$$\Omega \text{ is an open bounded connected polygonal subset of } \mathbb{R}^d,\ d \in \mathbb{N}^\star, \tag{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\Lambda \text{ is a measurable function from } \Omega \text{ to } \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R}),\\ &\text{where } \mathcal{M}_d(\mathbb{R}) \text{ denotes the set of } d\times d \text{ matrices},\\ &\text{such that for a.e. } x\in\Omega, \Lambda(x) \text{ is symmetric},\\ &\text{and the set of its eigenvalues is included in } [\alpha(x),\beta(x)]\\ &\text{where } \alpha,\beta\in L^\infty(\Omega) \text{ are such that}\\ &0<\alpha_0\le\alpha(x)\le\beta(x) \text{ for a.e. } x\in\Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

and

$$f \in L^2(\Omega). \tag{4}$$

We give the classical weak formulation in the following definition.

Definition 1.1 (Weak solution) *Under hypotheses (2)-(4), we say that $\bar{u}$ is a weak solution of (1) if*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \bar{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega), \\ \displaystyle\int_\Omega \Lambda(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\cdot\nabla v(x)\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega f(x)v(x)\mathrm{d}x, \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega). \end{array} \right. \tag{5}$$

Remark 1.1 *For the sake of clarity, we restrict ourselves here to the numerical analysis of Problem (1), however, the present analysis readily extends to convection-diffusion-reaction problems and coupled problems. Indeed, we emphasize that proofs of convergence or error estimate can easily be adapted to such situations, since the discretization methods of all these terms are independent of one another, and the treatment of convection and reaction term is well-known exact(see [16] or [8]).*

The outline of this paper is the following. In Section 2, we present the method for approximating the gradient of a piecewise constant function, and we show some functional properties which help to understand why the present definition of a gradient is well suited for second order diffusion problems. In Section 3, we present the finite volume scheme for Problem (1), and we show the strong convergence of the discrete solution and of its discrete gradient. In Section 4, we give an error estimate for Problem (1), and we illustrate this study by some numerical examples in Section 5. Some short conclusions are drawn in Section 6.

2 A discrete gradient for piecewise constant functions

We present in this section a method for the approximation of the gradient of piecewise constant functions, in the case of grids satisfying some orthogonality condition as defined below.

2.1 Admissible discretization of Ω

We first present the following notion of admissible discretization, which is taken in [8]. The notations are summarized in Figure 1 for the particular case $d = 2$ (we recall that the case $d \geq 3$ is considered as well).



Figure 1: Notations for a control volume K in the case $d = 2$

In the following definition, we shall say that a bounded subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$ is polygonal if its boundary is included in the union of a finite number of hyperplanes.

Definition 2.1 [Admissible discretization] *Let Ω be an open bounded polygonal subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, and $\partial\Omega = \overline{\Omega} \setminus \Omega$ its boundary. An admissible finite volume discretization of Ω, denoted by $\mathcal{D}$, is given by $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$, where:*

- *$\mathcal{M}$ is a finite family of non empty open polygonal convex disjoint subsets of Ω (the "control volumes") such that $\overline{\Omega} = \cup_{K\in\mathcal{M}}\overline{K}$. For any $K \in \mathcal{M}$, let $\partial K = \overline{K} \setminus K$ be the boundary of K and $\mathrm{m}(K) > 0$ denote the measure of K.*

- *$\mathcal{E}$ is a finite family of disjoint subsets of $\overline{\Omega}$ (the "edges" of the mesh), such that, for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}$, there exists a hyperplane E of $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $K \in \mathcal{M}$ with $\overline{\sigma} = \partial K \cap E$ and σ is a non empty open subset of E. We then denote by $m_\sigma > 0$ the $(d-1)$-dimensional measure of σ. We assume that, for all $K \in \mathcal{M}$, there exists a subset $\mathcal{E}_K$ of $\mathcal{E}$ such that $\partial K = \cup_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K}\overline{\sigma}$. It then results from the previous hypotheses that, for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}$, either $\sigma \subset \partial\Omega$ or there exists $(K, L) \in \mathcal{M}^2$ with $K \neq L$ such that $\overline{K} \cap \overline{L} = \overline{\sigma}$; we denote in the latter case $\sigma = K|L$.*

- *$\mathcal{P}$ is a family of points of Ω indexed by $\mathcal{M}$, denoted by $\mathcal{P} = (x_K)_{K\in\mathcal{M}}$. The coordinates of x_K are denoted by $x_K^{(i)}$, $i = 1, \ldots, d$. The family $\mathcal{P}$ is such that, for all $K \in \mathcal{M}$, $x_K \in K$. Furthermore, for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}$ such that there exists $(K, L) \in \mathcal{M}^2$ with $\sigma = K|L$, it is assumed that the straight line (x_K, x_L) going through x_K and x_L is orthogonal to $K|L$. For all $K \in \mathcal{M}$ and all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$, let z_σ be the orthogonal projection of x_K on σ. We suppose that $z_\sigma \in \sigma$ if $\sigma \subset \partial\Omega$.*

The following notations are used. The size of the discretization is defined by:

$$h_{\mathcal{D}} = \sup\{\mathrm{diam}(K), K \in \mathcal{M}\}.$$

For all $K \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$, we denote by $\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$ the unit vector normal to σ outward to K. We denote by $d_{K,\sigma}$ the Euclidean distance between x_K and σ. We then define

$$\tau_{K,\sigma} = \frac{m_\sigma}{d_{K,\sigma}}.$$

The set of interior (resp. boundary) edges is denoted by $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{ext}}$), that is $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}} = \{\sigma \in \mathcal{E};\ \sigma \not\subset \partial\Omega\}$ (resp. $\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{ext}} = \{\sigma \in \mathcal{E};\ \sigma \subset \partial\Omega\}$). For all $K \in \mathcal{M}$, we denote by $\mathcal{N}_K$ the subset of $\mathcal{M}$ of the neighbouring control volumes, and we denote by $\mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}} = \mathcal{E}_K \cap \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{ext}}$. For all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}$, let $K, L \in \mathcal{M}$ be such that $\sigma = K|L$; we define by $d_{K|L}$ the Euclidean distance between x_K and x_L, by $\mathbf{n}_{KL}$ the unit normal vector to $K|L$ from K to L, and we set

$$\tau_\sigma = \frac{m_\sigma}{d_{K|L}}. \tag{6}$$

For all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{ext}}$, let $K \in \mathcal{M}$ be such that $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$; we define

$$\tau_\sigma = \tau_{K,\sigma}. \tag{7}$$

For all $K \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$, we define

$$D_{K,\sigma} = \{t x_K + (1-t)y, t \in (0,1),\ y \in \sigma\},$$

For all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}$, let $K, L \in \mathcal{M}$ be such that $\sigma = K|L$; we set $D_\sigma = D_{K,\sigma} \cup D_{L,\sigma}$. For all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{ext}}$, let $K \in \mathcal{M}$ be such that $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$; we define $D_\sigma = D_{K,\sigma}$.
For all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}$, we define

$$x_\sigma = \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(\sigma)} \int_\sigma x \, \mathrm{d}\gamma(x). \tag{8}$$

We shall measure the regularity of the mesh through the function $\theta_\mathcal{D}$ defined by

$$\theta_\mathcal{D} = \inf \left\{ \frac{d_{K,\sigma}}{\mathrm{diam}(K)}, K \in \mathcal{M}, \ \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K \right\}. \tag{9}$$

Definition 2.2 *Let Ω be an open bounded polygonal subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, and $\mathcal{D}$ an admissible discretization of Ω in the sense of Definition (2.1). We define $H_\mathcal{D}$ as the set of functions $u \in L^2(\Omega)$ which are constant in each control volume. For $u \in H_\mathcal{D}$, we denote by u_K the constant value of u in K. We define the interpolation operator $P_\mathcal{D} : C(\overline{\Omega}) \to H_\mathcal{D}$, by $\bar{u} \mapsto P_\mathcal{D}\bar{u}$ such that*

$$P_\mathcal{D}\bar{u}(x) = \bar{u}(x_K) \text{ for a.e. } x \in K, \ \forall K \in \mathcal{M}. \tag{10}$$

For $(u, v) \in (H_\mathcal{D})^2$ and for any function $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we introduce the following symmetric bilinear form:

$$[u, v]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha} = \sum_{K|L \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{int}}} \tau_{K|L} \alpha_{K|L} (u_L - u_K)(v_L - v_K) + \sum_{K \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{K,\text{ext}}} \tau_{K,\sigma} \alpha_\sigma u_K v_K, \tag{11}$$

where we set

$$\alpha_\sigma = \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(D_\sigma)} \int_{D_\sigma} \alpha(x) \mathrm{d}x, \ \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{E}. \tag{12}$$

Remark 2.1 *One could also take, for α_σ, the harmonic averaging of the values in K and L when $\sigma = K|L$.*

We then define a norm in $H_\mathcal{D}$ (thanks to the discrete Poincaré inequality (13) given below) by

$$\|u\|_\mathcal{D} = \left([u, u]_{\mathcal{D},1}\right)^{1/2}$$

(where 1 denotes the constant function equal to 1). Indeed, the discrete Poincaré inequality writes (see [8]):

$$\|w\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le \mathrm{diam}(\Omega) \|w\|_\mathcal{D}, \ \forall w \in H_\mathcal{D}. \tag{13}$$

Let us now give a relative compactness result, which is also partly stated in some other papers concerning finite volume methods [8], [12].

Lemma 2.1 (Relative compactness in $L^2(\Omega)$) *Let Ω be an open bounded connected polygonal subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}^\star$ and let $(\mathcal{D}_n, u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence such that, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{D}_n$ is an admissible finite volume discretization of Ω in the sense of Definition 2.1 and $u_n \in H_{\mathcal{D}_n}(\Omega)$ (cf Definition 2.2). Let us assume that $\lim_{n \to \infty} h_{\mathcal{D}_n} = 0$, and that there exists $C_1 > 0$ such that $\|u_n\|_{\mathcal{D}_n} \le C_1$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*
Then there exists a subsequence of $(\mathcal{D}_n, u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, again denoted $(\mathcal{D}_n, u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $\bar{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that u_n tends to $\bar{u}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $n \to +\infty$, and the inequality

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla \bar{u}(x)|^2 \mathrm{d}x \le \liminf_{n \to \infty} \|u_n\|^2_{\mathcal{D}_n} \tag{14}$$

holds. Moreover, for all function $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}[u_n, P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D}_n,\alpha} = \int_\Omega \alpha(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\cdot\nabla\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x,\ \forall\varphi\in \mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\Omega). \tag{15}$$

PROOF. The proof of the existence of the subsequence again denoted $(\mathcal{D}_n, u_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$, and of $\bar{u}\in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that u_n tends to $\bar{u}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $n\to\infty$, is given in [8]. Assertion (14) was proven in [12] (Lemma 5.2). Let us first show (15) in the case $\alpha\in \mathrm{C}^1(\bar{\Omega})$. Let $\varphi\in\mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\Omega)$. Defining, for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$, $T_1^{(n)} = -\int_\Omega u_n(x)\mathrm{div}(\alpha(x)\nabla\varphi(x))\mathrm{d}x$, we get that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} T_1^{(n)} = -\int_\Omega \bar{u}(x)\mathrm{div}(\alpha(x)\nabla\varphi(x))\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega \alpha(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\cdot\nabla\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x.$$

We consider a value n sufficiently large such that for all $K\in\mathcal{M}_n$ and $x\in K$, if $\varphi(x)\neq 0$ then $\partial K\cap\partial\Omega=\emptyset$. Defining $T_2^{(n)} = [u_n, P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D}_n,\alpha} - T_1^{(n)}$, we obtain

$$T_2^{(n)} = \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}},\ \sigma=K|L} \mathrm{m}(K|L)(u_L-u_K)R_{KL},$$

with

$$R_{KL} = \alpha_{K|L}\frac{\varphi(x_L)-\varphi(x_K)}{d_{K|L}} - \int_{K|L}\alpha(x)\nabla\varphi(x)\cdot\mathbf{n}_{KL}\mathrm{d}\gamma(x),\ \forall K\in\mathcal{M},\ \forall L\in\mathcal{N}_K.$$

Since there exists some real value C_2, which does not depend on $\mathcal{D}_n$, such that $|R_{KL}|\le C_2 h_{\mathcal{D}_n}$, we conclude in a similar way as in [8] that $\lim_{n\to\infty}T_2^{(n)}=0$, which gives (15) in this case. Let us now consider the general case $\alpha\in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Let $\varepsilon>0$ be given. We first choose a function $\tilde{\alpha}\in\mathrm{C}^1(\bar{\Omega})$ such that $\|\alpha-\tilde{\alpha}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\le\varepsilon$. Then we have, for all $n\in\mathbb{N}$, using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}([u_n, P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D}_n,\tilde{\alpha}} - [u_n, P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D}_n,\alpha})^2 \le & \sum_{K|L\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}}\tau_{K|L}(\tilde{\alpha}_{KL}-\alpha_{KL})^2|\varphi(x_L)-\varphi(x_K)|^2\\ &\times\sum_{K|L\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}}\tau_{K|L}|u_L-u_K|^2\end{aligned}$$

and therefore, setting $C_3=\|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, the properties $|\varphi(x_L)-\varphi(x_K)|\le C_3 d_{K|L}$ and $\mathrm{m}(K|L)d_{K|L} = d\ \mathrm{m}(D_{K|L})$ lead to

$$([u_n, P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D}_n,\tilde{\alpha}} - [u_n, P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D}_n,\alpha})^2 \le d\ C_3^2\|\alpha-\tilde{\alpha}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 C_1 \le d\ C_3^2\varepsilon^2 C_1.$$

In the same manner, we get

$$\left(\int_\Omega\tilde{\alpha}(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\cdot\nabla\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega\alpha(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\cdot\nabla\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x\right)^2 \le C_3^2\varepsilon^2\|\nabla\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}^2.$$

Since $\tilde{\alpha}\in\mathrm{C}^1(\Omega)$, we can apply (15), proven above for such a function. It then suffices to choose n large enough such that

$$\left|[u_n, P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D}_n,\tilde{\alpha}} - \int_\Omega\tilde{\alpha}(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\cdot\nabla\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x\right|\le\varepsilon,$$

to prove that

$$\left|[u_n, P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D}_n,\alpha} - \int_\Omega\alpha(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\cdot\nabla\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x\right|\le C_4\ \varepsilon,$$

where the real $C_4>0$ does not depend on n. This concludes the proof of (15) in the general case. □

2.2 Definition of a discrete gradient

We now define a discrete gradient for piecewise constant functions on an admissible discretization.

Definition 2.3 (Discrete gradient) *Let Ω be an open bounded connected polygonal subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}^\star$. Let $\mathcal{D} = (\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{P})$ be an admissible finite volume discretization of Ω in the sense of Definition 2.1. Let us define, for all $K \in \mathcal{M}$, for all $L \in \mathcal{N}_K$,*

$$A_{K,L} = \tau_{K|L}(x_{K|L} - x_K), \tag{16}$$

and for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}$, we define

$$A_{K,\sigma} = \tau_\sigma(x_\sigma - x_K). \tag{17}$$

We define the discrete gradient $\nabla_\mathcal{D} : H_\mathcal{D} \to H_\mathcal{D}^d$, for any $u \in H_\mathcal{D}$, by:

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_\mathcal{D} u(x) &= (\nabla_\mathcal{D} u)_K \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(K)}\left(\sum_{L\in\mathcal{N}_K} A_{K,L}\ (u_L - u_K) - \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}} A_{K,\sigma}\ u_K\right), \\ &\textit{for a.e. } x \in K,\ \forall K \in \mathcal{M}.\end{aligned}$$

Let us first state a bound for the $L^2(\Omega)^d$ norm of the discrete gradient of any element of $H_\mathcal{D}$.

Lemma 2.2 (Bound for $\nabla_\mathcal{D} u$) *Let Ω be an open bounded connected polygonal subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}^\star$, let $\mathcal{D}$ be an admissible finite volume discretization of Ω in the sense of Definition 2.1 and let $\theta \in (0, \theta_\mathcal{D}]$. Then, there exists C_5, only depending on d and θ, such that, for all $u \in H_\mathcal{D}$:*

$$\|\nabla_\mathcal{D} u\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \le C_5 \|u\|_\mathcal{D}. \tag{18}$$

Proof. Let $u \in H_\mathcal{D}$. Let us denote, for all $K \in \mathcal{M}$, $L \in \mathcal{N}_K$ and $\sigma = K|L$, $\delta_{K,\sigma} u = u_L - u_K$, and for $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}$, $\delta_{K,\sigma} u = -u_K$. Then Definition (11) leads to

$$\|u\|_\mathcal{D}^2 = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}}\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_{L\in\mathcal{N}_K} \tau_{K|L}(\delta_{K,K|L} u)^2 + \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}} \tau_\sigma (\delta_{K,\sigma} u)^2\right),$$

and Definition (2.3) leads, for a given $K \in \mathcal{M}$, to

$$\mathrm{m}(K)(\nabla_\mathcal{D} u)_K = \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} \tau_\sigma (x_\sigma - x_K)\delta_{K,\sigma} u.$$

Using the Cauchy-Scharwz inequality, we obtain

$$\mathrm{m}(K)^2 |(\nabla_\mathcal{D} u)_K|^2 \le \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} \tau_\sigma |x_\sigma - x_K|^2 \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} \tau_\sigma (\delta_{K,\sigma} u)^2,$$

and, since, for $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$, one has $|x_\sigma - x_K| = \mathrm{d}(x_\sigma, x_K) \le \frac{d_{K,\sigma}}{\theta}$,

$$\mathrm{m}(K)^2 |(\nabla_\mathcal{D} u)_K|^2 \le \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} \frac{1}{\theta^2}\mathrm{m}(\sigma) d_{K,\sigma} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} \tau_\sigma (\delta_{K,\sigma} u)^2. \tag{19}$$

Since $\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} \mathrm{m}(\sigma)d_{K,\sigma} = d\ \mathrm{m}(K)$, (19) gives:

$$\mathrm{m}(K)|(\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}u)_K|^2 \leq \frac{d}{\theta^2}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K}\tau_\sigma(\delta_{K,\sigma}u)^2.$$

Summing over $K \in \mathcal{M}$, we get

$$\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}u\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \leq 2\frac{d}{\theta^2}\|u\|^2_{\mathcal{D}}.$$

which gives (18) with $C_5 = (\frac{2d}{\theta^2})^{\frac{1}{2}}$. $\square$
We now state a weak convergence property for the discrete gradient.

Lemma 2.3 (Weak convergence of the discrete gradient)
Let Ω be an open bounded connected polygonal subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}^\star$, let $\mathcal{D}$ be an admissible finite volume discretization of Ω in the sense of Definition 2.1. We assume that there exist $u_{\mathcal{D}} \in H_{\mathcal{D}}$ and a function $\bar{u} \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ such that $u_{\mathcal{D}}$ tends to $\bar{u}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h_{\mathcal{D}}$ tends to 0 while $\|u_{\mathcal{D}}\|_{\mathcal{D}}$ remains bounded. Then $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}u_{\mathcal{D}}$ weakly tends to $\nabla\bar{u}$ in $L^2(\Omega)^d$ as $h_{\mathcal{D}} \to 0$.

PROOF. Let $\varphi \in C^\infty_c(\Omega)$. We assume that $h_{\mathcal{D}}$ is small enough to ensure that for all $K \in \mathcal{M}$ and $x \in K$, if $\varphi(x) \neq 0$ then $\mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}} = \emptyset$. The expression $T^{\mathcal{D}}_3$, defined by

$$T^{\mathcal{D}}_3 = \int_\Omega P_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi(x)\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}u_{\mathcal{D}}(x)\mathrm{d}x,$$

satisfies, using (16),

$$T^{\mathcal{D}}_3 = \sum_{K|L\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}}\tau_{K|L}(u_L - u_K)\left((x_{K|L} - x_K)\varphi(x_K) + (x_L - x_{K|L})\varphi(x_L)\right),$$

where we denote, for the sake of simplicity, $u_K = (u_{\mathcal{D}})_K$ for all $K \in \mathcal{M}$. We thus get $T^{\mathcal{D}}_3 = T^{\mathcal{D}}_4 + T^{\mathcal{D}}_5$ with

$$T^{\mathcal{D}}_4 = \sum_{K|L\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}}\tau_{K|L}(u_L - u_K)(x_L - x_K)\frac{\varphi(x_K) + \varphi(x_L)}{2}$$

and

$$T^{\mathcal{D}}_5 = \sum_{K|L\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}}\tau_{K|L}(u_L - u_K)(x_{K|L} - \frac{x_L + x_K}{2})(\varphi(x_L) - \varphi(x_K)).$$

Thanks to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$(T^{\mathcal{D}}_5)^2 \leq \sum_{K|L\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}}\tau_{K|L}(u_L - u_K)^2\sum_{K|L\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}}\tau_{K|L}(\varphi(x_L) - \varphi(x_K))^2|x_{K|L} - \frac{x_L + x_K}{2}|^2.$$

Since $|x_{K|L} - \frac{x_L+x_K}{2}| \leq \frac{1}{2}|x_{K|L} - x_L| + \frac{1}{2}|x_{K|L} - x_K| \leq h_{\mathcal{D}}$, there exists $C_6 > 0$, depending on d, Ω and φ such that,

$$(T^{\mathcal{D}}_5)^2 \leq \|u_{\mathcal{D}}\|^2_{\mathcal{D}}C_6h^2_{\mathcal{D}}\mathrm{m}(\Omega),$$

and therefore we get

$$\lim_{h_{\mathcal{D}}\to 0} T^{\mathcal{D}}_5 = 0.$$

We then compare $T_4^{\mathcal{D}}$ with

$$T_6^{\mathcal{D}} = -\int_\Omega u_{\mathcal{D}}(x)\nabla\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x = \sum_{K|L\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}} (u_L - u_K)\int_{K|L} \varphi(x)\mathbf{n}_{K,L}\mathrm{d}\gamma(x).$$

Since

$$\mathbf{n}_{K,L} = \frac{x_L - x_K}{d_{K|L}}$$

and since

$$\left|\frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(K|L)}\int_{K|L}\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}\gamma(x) - \frac{\varphi(x_K)+\varphi(x_L)}{2}\right| \le \|\nabla\varphi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\ h_{\mathcal{D}},$$

we get, thanks to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\lim_{h_{\mathcal{D}}\to 0}(T_4^{\mathcal{D}} - T_6^{\mathcal{D}})^2 = 0.$$

Since

$$\lim_{h_{\mathcal{D}}\to 0} T_6^{\mathcal{D}} = -\int_\Omega \bar{u}(x)\nabla\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega \varphi(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\mathrm{d}x,$$

we have thus proven, thanks to the density of $\mathrm{C}_c^\infty(\Omega)$ in $L^2(\Omega)$, the weak convergence of $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}u_{\mathcal{D}}$ to $\nabla\bar{u}(x)$ as $h_{\mathcal{D}}\to 0$. This completes the proof of the lemma. □

We now study, for a regular function φ, the strong convergence of the discrete gradient $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}P_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi$ to $\nabla\varphi$. This study uses the following lemma.

Lemma 2.4 *Let Ω be an open bounded connected polygonal subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d\in\mathbb{N}^\star$, let $\mathcal{D}$ be an admissible finite volume discretization of Ω in the sense of Definition 2.1. Then we have*

$$v = \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(K)}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K}\mathrm{m}(\sigma)(x_\sigma - x_0)\ (\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}\cdot v),\ \forall K\in\mathcal{M},\ \forall x_0\in\mathbb{R}^d,\ \forall v\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{20}$$

Proof. For any $K\in\mathcal{M}$, we denote, for a.e. $x\in\partial K$, by $\mathbf{n}_{\partial K}(x)$ the normal vector to ∂K at the point x outward K. Let v and $w\in\mathbb{R}^d$ be given. We have, considering vectors as $d\times 1$ matrices, and denoting by w^t the transposed $1\times d$ matrix of w,

$$\begin{aligned} w^t\ \left(\int_{\partial K}(x-x_0)\mathbf{n}_K^t(x)\mathrm{d}\gamma(x)\right)\ v = \int_{\partial K} w^t\ (x-x_0)\ \mathbf{n}_K^t(x)\ v\ \mathrm{d}\gamma(x) = \\ \int_{\partial K} w^t\ (x-x_0)\ v^t\mathbf{n}_K(x)\mathrm{d}\gamma(x) = \int_{\partial K}(v\ (x-x_0)^t\ w)\cdot\mathbf{n}_K(x)\mathrm{d}\gamma(x) = \\ \int_K \mathrm{div}(v\ (x-x_0)^t\ w)dx = \mathrm{m}(K)\ v^t\ w. \end{aligned}$$

This gives (20). □

Lemma 2.5 (Consistency property of the discrete gradient) *Let Ω be an open bounded connected polygonal subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d\in\mathbb{N}^\star$, let $\mathcal{D}$ be an admissible finite volume discretization in the sense of Definition 2.1 and let $\theta\in(0,\theta_{\mathcal{D}}]$. Let $\bar{u}\in\mathrm{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$ be such that $\bar{u}=0$ on the boundary of Ω. Then, there exists C_7, only depending on Ω, θ and $\bar{u}$, such that:*

$$\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{u} - \nabla\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \le C_7\ h_{\mathcal{D}}. \tag{21}$$

(Recall that $P_{\mathcal{D}}$ is defined by (10) and $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}$ in Definition 2.3.)

Proof. From Definition 2.3 and (10), we can write for any $K \in \mathcal{M}$

$$\mathrm{m}(K)(\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} P_{\mathcal{D}} \bar{u})_K = \sum_{L \in \mathcal{N}_K} \tau_{K|L}(x_{K|L} - x_K)(\bar{u}(x_L) - \bar{u}(x_K)) - \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}} \tau_\sigma (x_\sigma - x_K)\bar{u}(x_K). \quad (22)$$

Let $(\nabla \bar{u})_K$ be the mean value of $\nabla \bar{u}$ on K:

$$(\nabla \bar{u})_K = \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(K)} \int_K \nabla \bar{u}(x) \mathrm{d}x.$$

Thanks to the regularity of $\bar{u}$ (and the fact that $\bar{u} = 0$ on the boundary of Ω), there exists C_8, only depending on $\bar{u}$ (indeed, C_8 only depends on the L^∞-norm of the second derivatives of $\bar{u}$), such that, for all $\sigma = K|L \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}$,

$$|e_\sigma| \le C_8 h_{\mathcal{D}}, \text{ with } e_\sigma = (\nabla \bar{u})_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} - \frac{\bar{u}(x_L) - \bar{u}(x_K)}{d_\sigma}, \quad (23)$$

and, for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}$,

$$|e_\sigma| \le C_8 h_{\mathcal{D}}, \text{ with } e_\sigma = (\nabla \bar{u})_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} - \frac{-\bar{u}(x_K)}{d_{K,\sigma}}. \quad (24)$$

Thanks to (22), (23) and (24), we get, for all $K \in \mathcal{M}$:

$$\mathrm{m}(K)(\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} P_{\mathcal{D}} \bar{u})_K = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} \mathrm{m}(\sigma)(x_\sigma - x_K)(\nabla \bar{u})_K \cdot \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma} + R_K,$$

with $R_K = -\sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} e_\sigma \mathrm{m}(\sigma) \mathrm{d}(x_\sigma, x_K)$. Applying (20) gives

$$\mathrm{m}(K)(\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} P_{\mathcal{D}} \bar{u})_K = \mathrm{m}(K)(\nabla \bar{u})_K + R_K. \quad (25)$$

Using the inequalities (23) and (24), we have

$$|R_K| \le \frac{C_8}{\theta} h_{\mathcal{D}} \sum_{\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K} \mathrm{m}(\sigma) d_{K,\sigma} = \frac{d\, C_8}{\theta} h_{\mathcal{D}} \mathrm{m}(K). \quad (26)$$

Then, from (25) and (26), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{K \in \mathcal{M}} |(\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} P_{\mathcal{D}} \bar{u})_K - (\nabla \bar{u})_K|^2 \mathrm{m}(K) \le \\ &\sum_{K \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\frac{d\, C_8}{\theta}\right)^2 h_{\mathcal{D}}^2 \mathrm{m}(K) = \mathrm{m}(\Omega) \left(\frac{d\, C_8}{\theta}\right)^2 h_{\mathcal{D}}^2. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

In order to conclude, we remark that, thanks to the regularity of $\bar{u}$, there exists C_9, only depending on $\bar{u}$ (here also, C_9 only depends on the L^∞-norm of the second derivatives of $\bar{u}$), such that:

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{M}} \int_K |\nabla \bar{u}(x) - (\nabla \bar{u})_K|^2 \mathrm{d}x \le C_9\, h_{\mathcal{D}}^2. \quad (28)$$

Then, using (27) and (28), we get the existence of C_7, only depending on Ω, θ and $\bar{u}$, such that (21) holds. □

Remark 2.2 (Choice of the points x_K and x_σ) *Note that in the proof of Lemma 2.3, one is free to choose any point lying on $K|L$ instead of $x_{K|L}$ in the definition of the coefficients $A_{K,L}$. However, we need this choice in the proof of the strong consistency of the discrete gradient (Lemma 2.5). Conversely, in the proof of Lemma 2.5, we could take any point of K instead of x_K in the definition of $A_{K,L}$. However, the choice of x_K is crucial in the proof of Lemma 2.3: when comparing the terms T_5 and T_6, one needs the property of consistency of the normal flux, which follows from the fact that $\mathbf{n}_{K,L} = \frac{x_L - x_K}{d_{K|L}}$.*

Lemma 2.6 (A sufficient condition for the strong convergence of the discrete gradient)
Let Ω be an open bounded connected polygonal subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \in \mathbb{N}^\star$, let $\theta > 0$ and let $\mathcal{D}$ be an admissible finite volume discretizations in the sense of Definition 2.1, such that $\theta_\mathcal{D} \geq \theta$. Assume that there exists a function $u_\mathcal{D} \in H_\mathcal{D}$ and a function $\bar{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $u_\mathcal{D}$ tends to $\bar{u}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $h_\mathcal{D}$ tend to 0. Assume also that there exists a function $\alpha \in L^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\alpha_0 > 0$ such that $\alpha(x) \geq \alpha_0$ for a.e. $x \in \Omega$ and $[u_\mathcal{D}, u_\mathcal{D}]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha}$ tends to $\int_\Omega \alpha(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)^2 \mathrm{d}x$ as $h_\mathcal{D}$ tends to 0. Then $\nabla_\mathcal{D} u_\mathcal{D}$ tends to $\nabla\bar{u}$ in $L^2(\Omega)^d$ as $h_\mathcal{D}$ tends to 0.

Proof. Let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ be given (this function is devoted to approximate $\bar{u}$ in $H_0^1(\Omega)$). Thanks to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\int_\Omega (\nabla_\mathcal{D} u_\mathcal{D}(x) - \nabla\bar{u}(x))^2 \mathrm{d}x \leq 3\ (T_7^\mathcal{D} + T_8^\mathcal{D} + T_9)$$

with

$$T_7^\mathcal{D} = \int_\Omega (\nabla_\mathcal{D} u_\mathcal{D}(x) - \nabla_\mathcal{D} P_\mathcal{D}\varphi(x))^2 \mathrm{d}x,$$

$$T_8^\mathcal{D} = \int_\Omega (\nabla_\mathcal{D} P_\mathcal{D}\varphi(x) - \nabla\varphi(x))^2 \mathrm{d}x,$$

and

$$T_9 = \int_\Omega (\nabla\varphi(x) - \nabla\bar{u}(x))^2 \mathrm{d}x.$$

We have, thanks to Lemma 2.5,

$$\lim_{h_\mathcal{D}\to 0} T_8^\mathcal{D} = 0. \tag{29}$$

Thanks to Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\int_\Omega (\nabla_\mathcal{D} v(x))^2 \mathrm{d}x \leq {C_5}^2 [v,v]_{\mathcal{D},1} \leq \frac{{C_5}^2}{\alpha_0}[v,v]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha},\ \forall v \in H_\mathcal{D}.$$

We thus get, setting $v = u_\mathcal{D} - P_\mathcal{D}\varphi$ in the above inequality, that

$$T_7^\mathcal{D} \leq \frac{{C_5}^2}{\alpha_0}([u_\mathcal{D}, u_\mathcal{D}]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha} - 2[u_\mathcal{D}, P_\mathcal{D}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha} + [P_\mathcal{D}\varphi, P_\mathcal{D}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha}).$$

We have, applying twice Lemma 2.1, that

$$\lim_{h_\mathcal{D}\to 0} [u_\mathcal{D}, P_\mathcal{D}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha} = \int_\Omega \alpha(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\cdot\nabla\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x \tag{30}$$

and

$$\lim_{h_{\mathcal{D}}\to 0}[P_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi, P_{\mathcal{D}}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha} = \int_\Omega \alpha(x)\nabla\varphi(x)^2 \mathrm{d}x. \tag{31}$$

Under the hypotheses of the lemma, we then get that

$$\limsup_{h_{\mathcal{D}}\to 0} T_7^{\mathcal{D}} \le \frac{{C_5}^2}{\alpha_0}\int_\Omega \alpha(x)(\nabla\bar{u}(x) - \nabla\varphi(x))^2 \mathrm{d}x.$$

We then get, gathering the above results, setting $C_{10} = \frac{{C_5}^2}{\alpha_0}\mathrm{ess\,sup}_{x\in\Omega}\,\alpha(x) + 1$, that

$$\int_\Omega (\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} u_{\mathcal{D}}(x) - \nabla\bar{u}(x))^2 \mathrm{d}x \le C_{10}\int_\Omega (\nabla\varphi(x) - \nabla\bar{u}(x))^2 \mathrm{d}x + T_{10}^{\mathcal{D}},$$

with

$$\lim_{h_{\mathcal{D}}\to 0} T_{10}^{\mathcal{D}} = 0. \tag{32}$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$. We can choose φ such that $\int_\Omega (\nabla\varphi(x) - \nabla\bar{u}(x))^2 \mathrm{d}x \le \varepsilon$, and we can then choose $h_{\mathcal{D}}$ such that $T_{10}^{\mathcal{D}} \le \varepsilon$. This completes the proof that

$$\lim_{h_{\mathcal{D}}\to 0}\int_\Omega (\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} u_{\mathcal{D}}(x) - \nabla\bar{u}(x))^2 \mathrm{d}x = 0. \tag{33}$$

□

Remark 2.3 *Thanks to Lemma 2.6, we get the strong convergence of the discrete gradient in the case of the classical finite volume scheme for an isotropic problem. Note that in the above proof, we did not use the weak convergence of the discrete gradient, and therefore any point of K can be taken instead of x_K in the definition of the coefficients $A_{K,L}$. We thus find that the average value in K of the gradient defined in [10] is also strongly convergent (the average of this gradient, defined by the generalized Raviart-Thomas basis functions, is obtained by replacing x_K by the barycenter of K in the definition of $A_{K,L}$). Note that the drawback of the generalization of the Raviart-Thomas basis was the difficulty for computing approximate values of the gradients. This drawback no longer exists for an averaged gradient. Nevertheless, the properties of convergence of the finite volume method shown here for non isotropic problems are only proven for the choice (16) in the definition of $A_{K,L}$, and not for the Raviart-Thomas basis.*

3 Application to Problem (1)

3.1 The finite volume scheme

Under hypotheses (2)-(4), let $\mathcal{D}$ be an admissible discretization of Ω in the sense of Definition 2.1. The finite volume approximation to Problem (1) is given as the solution of the following equation:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l} u_{\mathcal{D}} \in H_{\mathcal{D}}, \\ \int_\Omega (\Lambda(x) - \alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} u_{\mathcal{D}}(x)\cdot\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} v(x)\mathrm{d}x + [u_{\mathcal{D}}, v]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha} = \int_\Omega f(x)v(x)\mathrm{d}x,\ \forall v\in H_{\mathcal{D}}, \end{array}\right. \tag{34}$$

denoting by I_d the identity application of $\mathbb{R}^d$. The existence and the uniqueness of the solution $u_{\mathcal{D}}$ to (34) will be stated in Lemma 3.1. Note that in this formulation, we use the discrete gradient on part of the the operator only, while on a homogeneous part, we write the usual cell centered scheme. This needs to be done in order to obtain the stability of the scheme, that is some *a priori* estimate on the discrete solution. If we take $\alpha = 0$ in (34), we are no longer able to prove the discrete H^1 estimate (39) below. Taking for v the characteristic function of a control volume K in (34), we may note that Equation (34) is equivalent to finding the values $(u_K)_{K\in\mathcal{M}}$ (we again denote u_K instead of $(u_\mathcal{D})_K$), solution of the following system of equations:

$$\sum_{L\in\mathcal{N}_K} F_{KL} + \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}} F_{K\sigma} \ = \int_K f(x)\mathrm{d}x, \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{M}, \tag{35}$$

where

$$F_{KL} = \tau_{K|L}\alpha_{K|L}(u_K - u_L) + \left(\ \Lambda_L A_{LK} \cdot \nabla_\mathcal{D} u_L - \Lambda_K A_{KL} \cdot \nabla_\mathcal{D} u_K \ \right) \ \forall K|L \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}, \tag{36}$$

and

$$F_{K\sigma} = \tau_{K\sigma}\alpha_\sigma u_K + \Lambda_K A_{K\sigma} \cdot \nabla_\mathcal{D} u_K \ \forall \sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}. \tag{37}$$

In (36) and (37), the matrices $(\Lambda_K)_{K\in\mathcal{M}}$ are defined by:

$$\Lambda_K = \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(K)} \int_K (\Lambda(x) - \alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\mathrm{d}x. \tag{38}$$

On can then complete the discrete expressions of F_{KL} and $F_{K\sigma}$ using Definition 2.3 for A_{KL} $A_{K\sigma}$, and $\nabla_\mathcal{D} u_K$ for all $K \in \mathcal{M}$, $L \in \mathcal{N}_K$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$.
This is indeed a finite volume scheme, since

$$F_{KL} = -F_{LK}, \ \forall K|L \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}.$$

The existence of a solution to (34) will be proven below.

3.2 Discrete $H^1(\Omega)$ estimate

We now prove the following estimate:

Lemma 3.1 [Discrete H^1 estimate] *Under hypotheses (2)-(4), let $\mathcal{D}$ be an admissible discretization of Ω in the sense of Definition 2.1. Let $u \in H_\mathcal{D}$ be a solution to (34). Then the following inequalities hold:*

$$\alpha_0 \|u\|_\mathcal{D} \le \mathrm{diam}(\Omega)\|f\|_{(L^2(\Omega))^2}, \tag{39}$$

Proof. We apply (34) setting $v = u$. We get

$$\int_\Omega (\Lambda(x) - \alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla_\mathcal{D} u(x) \cdot \nabla_\mathcal{D} u(x)\mathrm{d}x + [u, u]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha} = \int_\Omega f(x)u(x)\mathrm{d}x,$$

which implies

$$\alpha_0[u, u]_\mathcal{D} \le \int_\Omega f(x)u(x)\mathrm{d}x.$$

Then the conclusion follows from the discrete Poincaré inequality (13). □
We can now state the existence and the uniqueness of a discrete solution to (34).

Corollary 3.1 **[Existence and uniqueness of a solution to the finite volume scheme]** *Under hypotheses (2)-(4), let $\mathcal{D}$ be an admissible discretization of Ω in the sense of Definition 2.1. Then there exists a unique $u_{\mathcal{D}}$ solution to (34).*

PROOF. System (34) is a linear system. Assume that $f = 0$. From the discrete Poincaré inequality (13), we get that $u = 0$. This proves that the linear system (34) is invertible. □

3.3 Convergence

We have the following result, which states the convergence of the scheme (34).

Theorem 3.1 **[Convergence of the finite volume scheme]** *Under hypotheses (2)-(4), let $\theta > 0$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be an admissible discretization of Ω in the sense of Definition 2.1, such that $\theta_{\mathcal{D}} \geq \theta$. Let $u_{\mathcal{D}} \in H_{\mathcal{D}}(\Omega)$ be the solution to (34). Then*

- *$u_{\mathcal{D}}$ converges in $L^2(\Omega)$ to $\bar{u}$, weak solution of Problem (1) in the sense of Definition 1.1,*
- *the discrete gradient $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} u_{\mathcal{D}}$ converges in $L^2(\Omega)^d$ to $\nabla \bar{u}$,*

as $h_{\mathcal{D}}$ tends to 0.

PROOF. We consider a sequence of admissible discretizations $(\mathcal{D}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ such that $h_{\mathcal{D}_n}$ tend to 0 as $n \to \infty$ and $\theta_{\mathcal{D}_n} \geq \theta$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Thanks to Lemma 3.1, we can apply the compactness result (2.1), which gives the existence of a subsequence (again denoted $(\mathcal{D}_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$), and of $\bar{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that $u_{\mathcal{D}_n}$ (given by (34) with $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}_n$) tends to $\bar{u}$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $n \to \infty$. Let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ be given, we choose $v = P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi$ as test function in (34). We obtain

$$\int_\Omega (\Lambda(x) - \alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla_{\mathcal{D}_n} u_{\mathcal{D}_n}(x) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}_n} P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x + [u_{\mathcal{D}_n}, P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D}_n,\alpha} = \int_\Omega f(x) P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x. \quad (40)$$

We let $n \to \infty$ in (40). Thanks to Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.5 (which provide a weak/strong convergence result), we get that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega (\Lambda(x) - \alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla_{\mathcal{D}_n} u_{\mathcal{D}_n}(x) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}_n} P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega (\Lambda(x) - \alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla\bar{u}(x) \cdot \nabla\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x.$$

Using Lemma 2.1, we get that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} [u_{\mathcal{D}_n}, P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi]_{\mathcal{D}_n,\alpha} = \int_\Omega \alpha(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x) \cdot \nabla\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x.$$

Since it is easy to see that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega f(x) P_{\mathcal{D}_n}\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega f(x)\varphi(x)\mathrm{d}x,$$

we thus get that any limit $\bar{u}$ of a subsequence of solutions satisfies (5) with $v = \varphi$. A classical density argument and the uniqueness of the solution to (5) permit to conclude to the convergence in $L^2(\Omega)$ of $u_{\mathcal{D}}$ to $\bar{u}$, weak solution of the problem in the sense of Definition 1.1, as $h_{\mathcal{D}}$ tends to 0, thanks to the fact that $\theta_{\mathcal{D}} \geq \theta$. Let us now prove the strong convergence of $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} u_{\mathcal{D}}$ to $\nabla\bar{u}$. We have, using (34) with $v = u_{\mathcal{D}}$,

$$\int_\Omega (\Lambda(x) - \alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} u_{\mathcal{D}}(x) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} u_{\mathcal{D}}(x)\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega f(x) u_{\mathcal{D}}(x)\mathrm{d}x - [u_{\mathcal{D}}, u_{\mathcal{D}}]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha}. \quad (41)$$

Thanks to Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\int_\Omega \alpha(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)^2\mathrm{d}x \le \liminf_{h_\mathcal{D}\to 0}[u_\mathcal{D},u_\mathcal{D}]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha},$$

and therefore, passing to the limit in (41), we get that

$$\limsup_{h_\mathcal{D}\to 0}\int_\Omega(\Lambda(x)-\alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla_\mathcal{D}u_\mathcal{D}(x)\cdot\nabla_\mathcal{D}u_\mathcal{D}(x)\mathrm{d}x \le \int_\Omega f(x)u_\mathcal{D}(x)\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega \alpha(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)^2\mathrm{d}x.$$

We then have, letting $v=\bar{u}$ in (5),

$$\int_\Omega(\Lambda(x)-\alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\cdot\nabla\bar{u}(x)\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega f(x)\bar{u}(x)\mathrm{d}x - \int_\Omega \alpha(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)^2\mathrm{d}x. \tag{42}$$

This leads to

$$\limsup_{h_\mathcal{D}\to 0}\int_\Omega(\Lambda(x)-\alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla_\mathcal{D}u_\mathcal{D}(x)\cdot\nabla_\mathcal{D}u_\mathcal{D}(x)\mathrm{d}x \le \int_\Omega(\Lambda(x)-\alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\cdot\nabla\bar{u}(x)\mathrm{d}x.$$

Using Lemma 2.3, which states the weak convergence of the gradient $\nabla_\mathcal{D}u_\mathcal{D}$ to $\nabla\bar{u}$, we get that

$$\int_\Omega(\Lambda(x)-\alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\cdot\nabla\bar{u}(x)\mathrm{d}x \le \liminf_{h_\mathcal{D}\to 0}\int_\Omega(\Lambda(x)-\alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla_\mathcal{D}u_\mathcal{D}(x)\cdot\nabla_\mathcal{D}u_\mathcal{D}(x)\mathrm{d}x.$$

The above inequalities yield

$$\lim_{h_\mathcal{D}\to 0}\int_\Omega(\Lambda(x)-\alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla_\mathcal{D}u_\mathcal{D}(x)\cdot\nabla_\mathcal{D}u_\mathcal{D}(x)\mathrm{d}x = \int_\Omega(\Lambda(x)-\alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\cdot\nabla\bar{u}(x)\mathrm{d}x. \tag{43}$$

From (41), (42) and (43), we thus obtain that

$$\lim_{h_\mathcal{D}\to 0}[u_\mathcal{D},u_\mathcal{D}]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha} = \int_\Omega \alpha(x)\nabla\bar{u}(x)^2\mathrm{d}x,$$

Therefore we can apply Lemma 2.6. This completes the proof of the strong convergence of the discrete gradient. □

4 Error estimate

We now give an error estimate, assuming first that the solution of (5) is in $\mathrm{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$. In Theorem 4.2, we will consider the weaker hypothesis that the solution of (5) is only in $H^2(\Omega)$ under the assumption $d\le 3$.

Theorem 4.1 (**C^2 error estimate**) *Assume hypotheses (2)-(4) and that Λ and α are of class C^1 on $\overline{\Omega}$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be an admissible finite volume discretization (in the sense of Definition 2.1). Let $\theta\in(0,\theta_\mathcal{D}]$, where $\theta_\mathcal{D}$ is defined by (9). Let $u_\mathcal{D}\in H_\mathcal{D}$ be the solution of (34) and $\bar{u}\in H^1_0(\Omega)$ be the solution of (5). We assume that $\bar{u}\in\mathrm{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$.*
Let us first assume that

$$\forall\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{ext}}, \int_\sigma \Lambda(x)\mathbf{n}_{\partial\Omega}(x)\cdot(x_\sigma-z_\sigma)\mathrm{d}\gamma(x)=0, \tag{44}$$

where $\mathbf{n}_{\partial\Omega}(x)$ is the unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$ at point x, outward to Ω.
Then, there exists C_{11} only depending on Ω, θ, α_0, α, β, Λ and $\|\bar{u}\|_{C^2(\Omega)}$, such that:

$$\|u_{\mathcal{D}} - P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{u}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \leq C_{11}h_{\mathcal{D}}, \tag{45}$$

$$\|u_{\mathcal{D}} - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C_{11}h_{\mathcal{D}}, \tag{46}$$

and

$$\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}u_{\mathcal{D}} - \nabla\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \leq C_{11}h_{\mathcal{D}}. \tag{47}$$

Let us then assume that (44) no longer holds, then there exists C_{12}, only depending on Ω, θ, α, β, Λ and $\|\bar{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$, such that (70), (71), (72) hold with $C_{12}\sqrt{h_{\mathcal{D}}}$ instead of $C_{11}h_{\mathcal{D}}$.

Remark 4.1 *Let us give some sufficient (and practical) conditions for (44) to hold :*

- *If the normal vector to $\partial\Omega$ is an eigenvector of $\Lambda(x)$ for a.e. $x \in \partial\Omega$, then (44) holds. Since this property is always satisfied in the isotropic case, the error estimate on the gradient (47) holds for the classical cell centered scheme, for any admissible mesh.*
- *If for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{ext}}$ with $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$, the barycenter x_σ of σ is equal to the orthogonal projection z_σ of x_K on σ, then (44) holds. This hypothesis is easy to ensure on rectangular and triangular meshes.*

Note also that one could replace (44) by $|z_\sigma - x_\sigma| \leq \frac{1}{\theta}\text{diam}(K)(h_{\mathcal{D}})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{ext}}$.

PROOF. In the proof, we denote by C_i ($i \in \mathbb{N}$), various quantities only depending on Ω, θ, α_0, α, β, Λ and $\|\bar{u}\|_{C^2(\Omega)}$.
Step 1. Let $v \in H_{\mathcal{D}}$. We first perform a computation of a consistency error, namely a bound for $|T_{11}(v)|$ where $T_{11}(v)$ is defined by:

$$\int_\Omega (\Lambda(x) - \alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{u}(x) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}}v(x)\mathrm{d}x + [P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{u}, v]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha} = \int_\Omega f(x)v(x)\mathrm{d}x + T_{11}(v). \tag{48}$$

We first consider the second term of the left hand side of (48). Using classical consistency error (also used in the proof of Lemma 2.1), one has:

$$[P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{u}, v]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha} = -\int_\Omega \text{div}(\alpha\nabla\bar{u})(x)v(x)\mathrm{d}x + T_{12}(v), \tag{49}$$

with

$$|T_{12}(v)| \leq \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}} \mathrm{m}(\sigma)|R_\sigma|\delta_\sigma v,$$

where $\delta_\sigma v = |v_K - v_L|$ if $\sigma = K|L$ is an interior edge, $\delta_\sigma v = |v_K|$ is $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\text{ext}}$ and $|R_\sigma| \leq C_{13}h_{\mathcal{D}}$. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, this leads to:

$$|T_{12}(v)| \leq C_{14}h_{\mathcal{D}}\|v\|_{\mathcal{D}}. \tag{50}$$

We now consider the first term of the left hand side of (48). We have

$$\int_\Omega (\Lambda(x) - \alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{u}(x) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}}v(x)\mathrm{d}x = T_{13}(v) + T_{14}(v), \tag{51}$$

with

$$T_{13}(v) = \int_\Omega (\Lambda(x) - \alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\cdot\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}v(x)\mathrm{d}x$$

and

$$|T_{14}(v)| \le C_{15}\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{u} - \nabla\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}v\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d}.$$

Using Lemma 2.5 and Lemma 2.2, we obtain

$$|T_{14}(v)| \le C_{16}h_{\mathcal{D}}\|v\|_{\mathcal{D}}. \tag{52}$$

We now compute $T_{13}(v)$. For $K\in\mathcal{M}$ and $\sigma\in\mathcal{E}$, let μ_K and μ_σ respectively be the mean values of $(\Lambda(x)-\alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla\bar{u}$ on K and σ:

$$\mu_K = \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(K)}\int_K (\Lambda(x)-\alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla\bar{u}(x)\mathrm{d}x,\ \ \mu_\sigma = \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(\sigma)}\int_\sigma (\Lambda(x)-\alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d\nabla\bar{u}(x)\mathrm{d}\gamma(x).$$

The regularity of $\bar{u}$, Λ and α gives, for all $K\in\mathcal{M}$ and all $\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K$ (recall that $|\cdot|$ denotes the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$):

$$|\mu_K - \mu_\sigma| \le C_{17}h_{\mathcal{D}}. \tag{53}$$

Indeed, C_{17} only depends on the L^∞-norms of Λ, α and $\nabla\bar{u}$ and on the L^∞-norms of the derivatives of Λ, α and $\nabla\bar{u}$.

We now use (53) in order to give a bound of $T_{13}(v)$ as a function of $h_{\mathcal{D}}$. Indeed, the definition of $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}v$ leads to:

$$\begin{aligned}
&T_{13}(v) = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}}\mu_K\cdot\mathrm{m}(K)(\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}v)_K = \\
&\sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}}\left(\sum_{L\in\mathcal{N}_K}\mu_K\cdot A_{K,L}\ (v_L - v_K) - \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}}\mu_K\cdot A_{K,\sigma}v_K\right) = \\
&\sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}}\left(\sum_{L\in\mathcal{N}_K}\mu_{K|L}\cdot A_{K,L}\ (v_L - v_K) - \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}}\mu_\sigma\cdot A_{K,\sigma}v_K\right) + T_{15}(v),
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
&|T_{15}(v)| \le C_{17}h_{\mathcal{D}}\sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}}\left(\sum_{L\in\mathcal{N}_K}|A_{K,L}||v_L - v_K| + \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}}|A_{K,\sigma}||v_K|\right) \le \\
&C_{17}h_{\mathcal{D}}\left(\sum_{\sigma=K|L\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}}(|A_{K,L}| + |A_{L,K}|)|v_L - v_K| + \sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}}|A_{K,\sigma}||v_K|\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $A_{K,L} = \tau_{K|L}(x_{K|L} - x_K)$ and $A_{K,\sigma} = \tau_\sigma(x_\sigma - x_K)$, one deduces from the preceding inequality, thanks to the definition of $\theta_{\mathcal{D}}$ (which gives $\mathrm{d}(x_\sigma, x_K) \le (d_{K,\sigma}/\theta)$ if $\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K$) and using Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality:

$$|T_{15}(v)| \le C_{18}h_{\mathcal{D}}\|v\|_{\mathcal{D}}. \tag{54}$$

We now remark that:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{13}(v) - T_{15}(v) = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}}\left(\sum_{L\in\mathcal{N}_K}\mu_{K|L}\cdot A_{K,L}\ (v_L - v_K) - \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}}\mu_\sigma\cdot A_{K,\sigma}v_K\right) = \\
\sum_{\sigma=K|L\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}}\mu_\sigma\cdot(x_L - x_K)\tau_\sigma(v_L - v_K) - \sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}}\mu_\sigma\cdot(x_\sigma - x_K)\tau_\sigma v_K.
\end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

For $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\rm int}$, one has $\sigma = K|L$ and $(x_L - x_K) = d_\sigma \mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$ where $\mathbf{n}_{K,\sigma}$ is the normal vector to σ exterior to K.

For $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\rm ext}$, one has $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$. Thanks to the fact that under homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions, the gradient of $\bar u$ is normal to the boundary, using Assumption (44), we get that

$$\mu_\sigma \cdot (x_\sigma - x_K)\tau_\sigma = \int_\sigma (\Lambda(x) - \alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d \nabla \bar u(x) \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\partial\Omega}(x)\mathrm{d}\gamma(x).$$

Then, one deduces from (55):

$$T_{13}(v) - T_{15}(v) = -\int_\Omega \mathrm{div}((\Lambda - \alpha \mathrm{I}_d)\nabla \bar u)(x) v(x)\mathrm{d}x. \tag{56}$$

Therefore, since $-\mathrm{div}(\Lambda\nabla\bar u) = f$, one has (48) with $T_{11}(v) = T_{12}(v) + T_{14}(v) + T_{15}(v)$. This gives, with (50), (52), (54):

$$|T_{11}(v)| \le C_{19} h_{\mathcal{D}} \|v\|_{\mathcal{D}}. \tag{57}$$

This concludes Step 1.

Step 2.

Let $e_{\mathcal{D}} = P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar u - u_{\mathcal{D}}$ be the discrete discretization error. Using (48) and (34) give, for all $v \in H_{\mathcal{D}}$:

$$\int_\Omega (\Lambda(x) - \alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} e_{\mathcal{D}}(x) \cdot \nabla_{\mathcal{D}} v(x)\mathrm{d}x + [e_{\mathcal{D}}, v]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha} = T_{11}(v).$$

Taking $v = e_{\mathcal{D}}$ in this formula gives, with (57), $[e_{\mathcal{D}}, e_{\mathcal{D}}]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha} \le C_{19} h_{\mathcal{D}} \|e_{\mathcal{D}}\|_{\mathcal{D}}$ and then, with $C_{20} = C_{19}/\alpha_0$ (since $\alpha_0 \|e_{\mathcal{D}}\|^2_{\mathcal{D}} \le [e_{\mathcal{D}}, e_{\mathcal{D}}]_{\mathcal{D},\alpha}$):

$$\|e_{\mathcal{D}}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \le C_{20} h_{\mathcal{D}}, \tag{58}$$

which is exactly (45).

Using the Discrete Poincaré Estimate (13) and the fact that $\bar u \in C(\overline{\Omega})$, one deduces (46) from (45).

The last estimate, Estimate (47), is a direct consequence of (58), (21) and (18). This concludes the first part of the theorem, *i.e.* assuming (44).

If $\mathcal{D}$ no longer satisfies the hypothesis (44), one has to replace (56) by:

$$T_{13}(v) - T_{15}(v) = -\int_\Omega \mathrm{div}((\Lambda - \alpha \mathrm{I}_d)\nabla \bar u)(x) v(x)\mathrm{d}x + T_{16}(v),$$

where, recalling that by z_σ the orthogonal projection of x_K on σ (see Definition 2.1):

$$T_{16}(v) = \sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{K,\rm ext}} \mu_\sigma \cdot (z_\sigma - x_\sigma)\tau_\sigma v_K.$$

Thanks to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we get

$$T_{16}(v)^2 \le \sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{K,\rm ext}} \tau_\sigma \mu_\sigma^2 (\mathrm{diam}(K))^2 \sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{K,\rm ext}} \tau_\sigma v_K^2,$$

which leads to

$$T_{16}(v)^2 \leq \frac{h_{\mathcal{D}}}{\theta} \mathrm{m}(\partial\Omega) \|\nabla \bar{u}\|_\infty^2 \|v\|_{\mathcal{D}}^2,$$

where $\mathrm{m}(\partial\Omega)$ is the $d-1$-dimensional Lebesgue measure of $\partial\Omega$. This gives (57) with $h_{\mathcal{D}}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ instead of $h_{\mathcal{D}}$. Following Step 2, this allows to conclude the proof. □

We now want an error estimate when the solution of (5) is in $H^2(\Omega)$ instead of $\mathrm{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$, in the case where the space dimension is lower or equal to 3. Indeed, the C^2-regularity of the solution of (5) was used, in the preceding proofs, only four times, namely to prove (23), (24) and (28) in Lemma 2.5 and to prove (53) in Theorem 4.1 (in fact, it is also used for the classical consistency error (49), but, for this term, the generalization to the case where the solution of (5) is in $H^2(\Omega)$ instead of $\mathrm{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$, in the case $d \leq 3$, is already done in [8]). We will now prove similar inequalities for $\bar{u} \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ (instead of $\bar{u} \in \mathrm{C}^2(\Omega)$ with $\bar{u} = 0$ on the boundary of Ω) which will allow us to obtain the desired error estimate.

Lemma 4.1 (Consistency of the gradient, $\bar{u} \in H^2(\Omega)$) *Under hypothesis (2), with $d \leq 3$, let $\mathcal{D}$ be an admissible finite volume discretization in the sense of Definition 2.1, and let $\theta \in (0, \theta_{\mathcal{D}}]$. Let $\bar{u} \in H^2(\Omega) \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$. Then, there exists C_{21}, only depending on Ω, θ and $\bar{u}$, such that:*

$$\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}(P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{u}) - \nabla\bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \leq C_{21} h_{\mathcal{D}} \|\bar{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}. \tag{59}$$

(Recall that $P_{\mathcal{D}}$ is defined in (10) and $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}$ in Definition 2.3.)

Proof.
The proof follows the proof of Lemma 2.5 (in particular, recall that $H^2(\Omega) \subset C(\overline{\Omega})$ since $d \leq 3$). The C^2-regularity was only used to prove (23), (24), (28). We now prove similar inequalities in the case $\bar{u} \in H^2(\Omega)$.

We begin with providing inequalities similar to (23), (24). We denote by $(\nabla\bar{u})_\sigma$ the mean value of $\nabla\bar{u}$ on σ (recall that $(\nabla\bar{u})_K$ is the mean value of $\nabla\bar{u}$ on K). We use Inequality (9.63) of [8] (in the proof of Theorem 9.4, using the H^2-regularity). This inequality states the existence of C_{22}, only depending on d and θ, such that, for all $\sigma = K|L \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}$:

$$|E_\sigma|^2 \leq C_{22} \frac{h_{\mathcal{D}}^2}{\mathrm{m}(\sigma) d_\sigma} \int_{D_\sigma} |H(\bar{u})(z)|^2 \mathrm{dz}, \text{ with } \mathrm{E}_\sigma = (\nabla\bar{\mathrm{u}})_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\mathrm{K},\sigma} - \frac{\bar{\mathrm{u}}(\mathrm{x_L}) - \bar{\mathrm{u}}(\mathrm{x_K})}{\mathrm{d}_\sigma}, \tag{60}$$

and, for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{ext}}$, if $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$:

$$|E_\sigma|^2 \leq C_{22} \frac{h_{\mathcal{D}}^2}{\mathrm{m}(\sigma) d_\sigma} \int_{D_\sigma} |H(\bar{u})(z)|^2 \mathrm{dz}, \text{ with } \mathrm{E}_\sigma = (\nabla\bar{\mathrm{u}})_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{n}_{\mathrm{K},\sigma} - \frac{-\bar{\mathrm{u}}(\mathrm{x_K})}{\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{K},\sigma}}, \tag{61}$$

where:

$$|H(\bar{u})(z)|^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^d |D_i D_j \bar{u}(z)|^2.$$

We have now to compare $(\nabla\bar{u})_\sigma$ and $(\nabla\bar{u})_K$. This is possible thanks to Inequality (9.38) in Lemma 9.4 of [8]. Following this result, there exists C_{23}, only depending on d and θ, such that, for all $K \in \mathcal{M}$, all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$ and all $v \in H^1(K)$:

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(K)} \int_K v(x)\mathrm{d}x - \frac{1}{\mathrm{m}(\sigma)} \int_\sigma v(x)\mathrm{d}\gamma(x)\right|^2 \le C_{23}\frac{\mathrm{diam}(K)}{\mathrm{m}(\sigma)} \int_K |\nabla v(x)|^2\mathrm{d}x \le \\ 2C_{23}\frac{h_{\mathcal{D}}^2}{\mathrm{m}(\sigma)d_\sigma} \int_K |\nabla v(x)|^2\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Using (62) with the derivatives of u, one deduces from (60) and (61), that there exists some real value C_{24} only depending on d and θ such that

$$|e_\sigma|^2 \le C_{24}\frac{h_{\mathcal{D}}^2}{\mathrm{m}(\sigma)d_\sigma} \int_{D_\sigma} |H(\bar u)(z)|^2\mathrm{dz},\ \text{with } \mathrm{e}_\sigma = (\nabla\bar{\mathrm{u}})_\mathrm{K}\cdot\mathbf{n}_{\mathrm{K},\sigma} - \frac{\bar{\mathrm{u}}(\mathrm{x_L}) - \bar{\mathrm{u}}(\mathrm{x_K})}{\mathrm{d}_\sigma}, \tag{63}$$

and, for all $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{ext}}$, if $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$:

$$|e_\sigma|^2 \le C_{24}\frac{h_{\mathcal{D}}^2}{\mathrm{m}(\sigma)d_\sigma} \int_{D_\sigma} |H(\bar u)(z)|^2\mathrm{dz},\ \text{with } \mathrm{e}_\sigma = (\nabla\bar{\mathrm{u}})_\mathrm{K}\cdot\mathbf{n}_{\mathrm{K},\sigma} - \frac{-\bar{\mathrm{u}}(\mathrm{x_K})}{\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{K},\sigma}}, \tag{64}$$

Since $|R_K| \le \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} \frac{\mathrm{m}(\sigma)d_{K,\sigma}}{\theta}|e_\sigma|$ (where R_K is defined in (25)), using the Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality, (63) and (64) lead to the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned}R_K^2 \le \frac{1}{\theta^2}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} \mathrm{m}(\sigma)d_{K,\sigma} \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} \mathrm{m}(\sigma)d_{K,\sigma}e_\sigma^2 \le \\ \frac{d\mathrm{m}(K)}{\theta^2}\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} \mathrm{m}(\sigma)d_{K,\sigma}C_{24}\frac{h_{\mathcal{D}}^2}{\mathrm{m}(\sigma)d_\sigma} \int_{D_\sigma} |H(\bar u)(z)|^2\mathrm{dz}\end{aligned}$$

and, since $d_{K,\sigma} \le d_\sigma$ and $\theta_{\mathcal{D}} \ge \theta$:

$$(\frac{R_K}{\mathrm{m}(K)})^2\mathrm{m}(K) \le \frac{d\ C_{24}}{\theta^2}h_{\mathcal{D}}^2 \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} \int_{D_\sigma} |H(\bar u)(z)|^2\mathrm{dz}.$$

Then, (27) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}} |(\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar u)_K - (\nabla\bar u)_K|^2\mathrm{m}(K) \le \\ \sum_K \frac{d\ C_{24}}{\theta^2}h_{\mathcal{D}}^2 \sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K} \int_{D_\sigma} |H(\bar u)(z)|^2\mathrm{dz},\end{aligned}$$

which gives the existence of C_{25}, only depending on d and θ such that:

$$\sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}} |(\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar u)_K - (\nabla\bar u)_K|^2\mathrm{m}(K) \le C_{25}h_{\mathcal{D}}^2\|\bar u\|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2. \tag{65}$$

We have now to obtain an inequality similar to (28) (but without using $\bar u \in \mathrm{C}^2(\overline{\Omega})$). We will use here the fact that $d_{K,\sigma} \ge \theta\mathrm{diam}(K)$ if $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$.
If ω is a convex, bounded, open subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$, the well-known "Mean Poincaré Inequality" gives, for all $v \in H^1(\omega)$:

$$\int_\omega |v(x) - m_\omega v|^2\mathrm{d}x \le \frac{1}{m(\omega)}d_\omega^2 m(B(0,d_\omega)) \int_\omega |\nabla v(x)|^2\mathrm{d}x, \tag{66}$$

where $m_\omega(v)$ is the mean value of v on ω, d_ω is the diameter of ω, $B(a,\delta)$ is the ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of center a and radius δ and $m(\omega)$ (resp. $m(B(a,\delta))$ is the d-dimensional Lebesgue measure of ω (resp. $B(a,\delta)$). (A discrete counterpart of (66) is given, for instance, in [8], Lemma 10.2.)

Let $K \in \mathcal{M}$. We will use (66) for $\omega = K$. Since $d_{K,\sigma}$ is the distance between x_K to σ (for $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$), there exists $\sigma \in \mathcal{E}_K$ such that $B(x_K, d_{K,\sigma}) \subset K$. Then, one has $m(B(0,1))d_{K,\sigma}^d = m(B(x_K, d_{K,\sigma})) \le \mathrm{m}(K)$ and, using $d_{K,\sigma} \ge \theta \mathrm{diam}(K)$, one obtains:

$$\mathrm{m}(K) \ge m(B(0,1))(\theta)^d(\mathrm{diam}(K))^d. \tag{67}$$

Taking $\omega = K$ in (66), gives, for all $K \in \mathcal{M}$ and all $v \in H^1(K)$:

$$\int_K |v(x) - m_\omega v|^2 \mathrm{d}x \le \frac{1}{\theta^d} \mathrm{diam}(K)^2 \int_K |\nabla v(x)|^2 \mathrm{d}x, \tag{68}$$

Taking v equal to the derivatives of $\bar{u}$ (which are in $H^1(K)$ for all $K \in \mathcal{M}$) in (68) gives the existence of C_{26}, only depending on d and θ, such that:

$$\sum_{K \in \mathcal{M}} \int_K |\nabla \bar{u}(x) - (\nabla \bar{u})_K|^2 \mathrm{d}x \le C_{26} h_{\mathcal{D}}^2 \|\bar{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}^2. \tag{69}$$

Then, we conclude as in Lemma 2.5, using (65) and (69), that there exists C_{21} only depending on Ω, θ and $\bar{u}$ such that (59) holds. $\square$

Theorem 4.2 (H^2 error estimate) *Assume hypotheses (2)-(4) with $d \le 3$, and that Λ and α are of class C^1 on $\overline{\Omega}$. Let $\mathcal{D}$ be an admissible finite volume discretization in the sense of Definition 2.1, and let $\theta \in (0, \theta_{\mathcal{D}}]$. We assume that that $\mathrm{card}(\mathcal{E}_K) \le \frac{1}{\theta}$ for all $K \in \mathcal{M}$. Let $u_{\mathcal{D}} \in H_{\mathcal{D}}$ be the solution of (34) and $\bar{u} \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ be the solution of (5). We assume that $\bar{u} \in H^2(\Omega)$ (which is necessarily true if Ω is convex).*
Let us first assume that Hypothesis (44) holds. Then, there exists C_{27}, only depending on Ω, θ, α, β, Λ and $\|\bar{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$, such that:

$$\|u_{\mathcal{D}} - P_{\mathcal{D}}\bar{u}\|_{\mathcal{D}} \le C_{27} h_{\mathcal{D}}, \tag{70}$$

$$\|u_{\mathcal{D}} - \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C_{27} h_{\mathcal{D}}, \tag{71}$$

and

$$\|\nabla_{\mathcal{D}} u_{\mathcal{D}} - \nabla \bar{u}\|_{L^2(\Omega)^d} \le C_{27} h_{\mathcal{D}}. \tag{72}$$

(Recall that $H_{\mathcal{D}}$, $\nabla_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{D}}$ are defined in Definition 2.3, $P_{\mathcal{D}}$ is defined in (10).)
Let us then assume that (44) no longer holds, then there exists C_{28}, only depending on Ω, θ, α, β, Λ and $\|\bar{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$, such that (70), (71), (72) hold with $C_{28}\sqrt{h_{\mathcal{D}}}$ instead of $C_{27} h_{\mathcal{D}}$.

PROOF.
The proof of Theorem 4.2 follows the proof of Theorem 4.1. The quantities C_{25} and C_{26}, depending on θ, are now used to get a bound for $T_{12}(v)$ (as in [1]), and the quantity C_{16}, also depending on θ since it is obtained with (59) (Lemma 4.1) instead of (21) (Lemma 4.1), is used to obtain a bound for $T_{14}(v)$.

In order to obtain a bound for $T_{15}(v)$ (and then to conclude the proof of Theorem 4.2), we need to obtain an inequality similar to (53) (where the C^2-regularity of $\bar{u}$ was used), which gives a bound for the difference between the mean values of $(\Lambda(x)-\alpha(x)\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla\bar{u}$ on K and on σ if $\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K$. Here, we will obtain a bound for the difference between these mean values using once again the consequence (62) of Inequality (9.38) in Lemma 9.4 of [8]. Applying (62) to the derivatives of $(\Lambda-\alpha\mathrm{I}_d)\nabla\bar{u}$, there exists C_{29} only depending on Ω, θ, Λ and α (indeed, the C^1-norms of Λ and α), such that, for all $K\in\mathcal{M}$, all $\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K$ and all $v\in H^1(K)$:

$$|\mu_K-\mu_\sigma|^2\le C_{29}\frac{\mathrm{diam}(K)}{\mathrm{m}(\sigma)}\|\bar{u}\|^2_{H^2(K)}. \tag{73}$$

Following the proof of Theorem 4.1, (73) is used to obtain a bound for $T_{15}(v)$:

$$|T_{15}(v)|\le\sum_{K\in\mathcal{M}}\left(\sum_{L\in\mathcal{N}_K}|\mu_{K|L}-\mu_K||A_{K,L}\;(v_L-v_K)|+\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{K,\mathrm{ext}}}|\mu_\sigma-\mu_K||A_{K,\sigma}v_K|\right)\le$$
$$\sum_{\sigma=K|L\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}}\frac{|\mu_\sigma-\mu_K|+|\mu_\sigma-\mu_L|}{\theta}\mathrm{m}(\sigma)d_\sigma\frac{\delta_\sigma v}{d_\sigma}+\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{ext}}}\frac{|\mu_\sigma-\mu_K|}{\theta}\mathrm{m}(\sigma)d_\sigma\frac{\delta_\sigma v}{d_\sigma},$$

where, in the last term, K is such that $\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_K$ and where $\delta_\sigma v=|v_K-v_L|$ if $\sigma=K|L\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}$ and $\delta_\sigma v=|v_K|$ if $\sigma=\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{ext}}\cap\mathcal{E}_K$. (We also used the fact that $|A_{K,L}|\le\frac{\mathrm{m}(\sigma)}{\theta}$ and $|A_{K,\sigma}|\le\frac{\mathrm{m}(\sigma)}{\theta}$, thanks to $\theta_{\mathcal{D}}\ge\theta$.)
Then, using Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality and (73), one obtains:

$$|T_{15}(v)|\le\|v\|_{\mathcal{D}}\frac{\sqrt{2C_5}}{\theta}\Big(\sum_{\sigma=K|L\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{int}}}d_\sigma(\mathrm{diam}(K)\|\bar{u}\|^2_{H^2(K)}+\mathrm{diam}(L)\|\bar{u}\|^2_{H^2(L)})$$
$$+\sum_{\sigma\in\mathcal{E}_{\mathrm{ext}}}d_\sigma\mathrm{diam}(K)\|\bar{u}\|^2_{H^2(K)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Using $d_\sigma\le 2h_{\mathcal{D}}$, $\mathrm{diam}(K)\le h_{\mathcal{D}}$ and the fact that $\mathrm{card}(\mathcal{E}_K)\le\frac{1}{\theta}$ for all $K\in\mathcal{M}$, one deduces the existence of C_6, only depending on Ω, θ, Λ and α, such that:

$$|T_{15}(v)|\le C_6h_{\mathcal{D}}\|\bar{u}\|_{H^2(\Omega)}\|v\|_{\mathcal{D}}. \tag{74}$$

Then, we conclude the proof of Theorem 4.2 exactly as in the proof of Theorem 4.1 ((74) replaces (54)). $\square$

5 Numerical results

The scheme was tried for various academic problems, for which the analytical solution is known. For the Laplace equation, we compared the classical cell centered scheme to the new scheme, which we shall call the gradient scheme in the sequel. First note that in the classical cell centered scheme, the equation relative to a given cell involves the neighbors of this cell, while in the gradient scheme, it involves the neighbors of this cell and the neighbors of the neighbors. Hence in the case of a rectangular (resp. parallelipedic) mesh, the classical cell centered scheme is a 5 points (resp. 7 points) scheme, while the gradient scheme is a 13 points (resp. 24 points) scheme, Similarly, if one uses a triangular (resp. tetrahedral) mesh the classical scheme is a 4 points (resp. 7 points) scheme, while the gradient scheme is a 10 points (resp. at most 17 points) scheme. Hence the gradient scheme is more expensive in terms of time and memory, although

	Case 1 homogeneous anisotropic		Case 2 heterogeneous anisotropic	
	Rectangles FV 13	Triangles VF10	Rectangles FV 13	Triangles VF10
u	2.00	2.0	2.2	2.0
∇u	1.00	1.0	1.4	1.3

Table 1: Rates of convergence of FV13 and FV10 in a homogeneous anisotropic case and in a heterogeneous anisotropic case

this is not so much, for example compared to the use of a Q^1 finite element in the case of a parallelipedic mesh, which leads to a 27 points scheme.
We tested the gradient scheme for some real anisotropic problems, the number of cells varying from 100 to 6400 in the rectangular meshes case (in fact, rectangles are squares), and from 700 to 17500 in the triangular meshes case. The convergence rates have been computed by fitting a less-square regression on the logarithmic values of the errors and of the characteristic size of the mesh.

The first case is an anisotropic homogenous problem with diffusion matrix

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} 1.5 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & 1.5 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The second case is a rotating permeability field, that is, the diffusion matrix is constant in the (r, θ) coordinates and equal to $\Lambda_{r,\theta} = \begin{pmatrix} 10 & .2 \\ .2 & 10 \end{pmatrix}$. The exact solution is taken to be $u(x_1, x_2) = \frac{1}{2}\ln((x_1 - .5)^2 + (x_2 - 1.1)^2)$, on the domain $\Omega =]0,1[\times]0,1[$. The orders of convergence which were found are given Table 1.
Next, we tested different values of α to see how it affected the discretization error, on the first anisotropic case. Although the value of α does influence the resulting discretization error, the optimal value seems to be independent on the mesh, in both the triangular and rectangular cases, see Figure 2. Note that in the case of the error on the solution itself, the numerical optimal values for α are beyond the interval of convergence assumed in the theoretical analysis $(0, 1)$.
These numerical tests therefore indicate that this use of an discrete gradient in finite volume schemes leads to a correct numerical behavior, indeed comparable with low degree finite element schemes on similar problems.
Finally, we replaced the point x_K by the center of gravity of cell K in the definition (16),(17) of the coefficients $A_{K,L}$. In this case, we recall (see Remark 2.3) that we obtain the discrete gradient based on the generalized Raviart-Thomas basis functions of [10]. Indeed, the tests performed with this scheme for Case 1 or Case 2 did not yield correct approximations of the solution nor of its gradient.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we constructed a discrete gradient for piecewise constant functions. This discrete gradient revealed several advantages: it is easy and cheap to compute, and it provides simple schemes for the approximation of anisotropic diffusion convection problems. We showed a weak htb



Figure 2: Diagrams of the errors on the solution (left) and its gradient (right) for various sizes of triangular (up) and rectangular (bottom) meshes, with respect to the value of the parameter α

property convergence of this discrete gradient to the gradient of the limit of the considered functions, together with a consistency property, both leading to the strong convergence of the discrete solution and of its discrete gradient in the case of a Dirichlet problem with full matrix diffusion.
Since this notion of admissible mesh includes Voronoï meshes, which are more and more used in practice, and which seem to remain tractable even in high space dimension, applications to financial mathematics problems are being studied [4]. Applications to finite volume schemes for compressible Navier-Stokes equations are also expected to be succesful [26]. Further work includes a parametric study, and the generalization to meshes without the orthogonality condition.

Aknowledgment This work was supported by GDR MOMAS.

References

[1] I. Aavatsmark, T. Barkve, O. Boe and T. Mannseth, Discretization on unstructured grids for inhomogeneous, anisotropic media. Part I: Derivation of the methods. *SIAM Journal on Sc. Comp.*, 19 (1998), 1700–1716.

[2] I. Aavatsmark, T. Barkve, O. Boe and T. Mannseth, Discretization on unstructured grids for inhomogeneous, anisotropic media. Part II: Discussion and numerical results. *SIAM Journal on Sc. Comp.*, 19 (1998), 1717–1736.

[3] L. Angermann, A finite element method for the numerical solution of convection-dominated anisotropic diffusion equations. *Numer. Math.* 85 (2000), 175–195.

[4] J. Berton Comparaison de différentes méthodes pour apprécier les options américaines. *Thesis of Marne-la-Vallée university (France)*, in preparation (2005).

[5] E. Chénier, R. Eymard and X. Nicolas, A Finite Volume Scheme for the Transport of Radionucleides *Porous Media: Simulation of Transport Around a Nuclear Waste Disposal Site: The COUPLEX Test Cases, Alain Bourgeat and Michel Kern eds, Computational Geosciences*, 8 (2004), 163–172.

[6] Y. Coudière, J.P. Vila and P. Villedieu, Convergence rate of a finite volume scheme for a two-dimensional convection-diffusion problem. *M2AN Math. Model. Numer. Anal.*, 33 (1999), 493–516.

[7] K. Domelevo, P. Omnes, A finite volume method for the Laplace equation on almost arbitrary two-dimensional grids. *submitted* (2005).

[8] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët and R. Herbin, Finite Volume Methods. *Handbook of Numerical Analysis, P.G. Ciarlet and J.L. Lions eds, North Holland*, 7 (2000), 713–1020.

[9] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët and R. Herbin, Convergence of finite volume approximations to the solutions of semilinear convection diffusion reaction equations. *Numer. Math.*, 82 (1999), 91–116.

[10] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët and R. Herbin, Finite volume approximation of elliptic problems and convergence of an approximate gradient. *Appl. Num. Math.*, 37 (2001),31–53.

[11] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët and R. Herbin, A finite volume for anisotropic diffusion problems. *Comptes rendus à l'Académie des Sciences* , 339 (2004), 299–302.

[12] R. Eymard, T. Gallouët, R. Herbin, A. Michel, Convergence of a finite volume scheme for nonlinear degenerate parabolic equations. *Num. Math*, 92 (2002), 41–82.

[13] R. Eymard, D. Hilhorst, M. Vohralík, Combined finite volume-nonconforming/mixed-hybrid finite element scheme for degenerate parabolic problems, *submitted* (2004).

[14] P.A. Forsyth, Control volume finite elements, A control volume finite element approach to NAPL groundwater contamination. *SIAM J. Sci. Stat. Comput.*, 12 (1991), 1029–1057.

[15] L.S.-K. Fung, L. Buchanan, and R. Sharma, Hybrid-CVFE Method for Flexible- Grid Reservoir Simulation. *Soc. Pet. Eng. J.*, 19 (1994), 188-199.

[16] T. Gallouët, R. Herbin and M.H. Vignal, Error estimate for the approximate finite volume solutions of convection diffusion equations with general boundary conditions. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, 37 (2000), 1935–1972.

[17] R. Herbin, An error estimate for a finite volume scheme for a diffusion-convection problem on a triangular mesh. *Num. Meth. P.D.E.* 11 (1995), 165-173.

[18] R. Herbin, Finite volume methods for diffusion convection equations on general meshes. *in Finite volumes for complex applications, Problems and Perspectives, F. Benkhaldoun and R. Vilsmeier eds, Hermes*, (1996) 153–160.

[19] F. Hermeline, A finite volume method for the approximation of diffusion operators on distorted meshes. *J. Comput. Phys.* 160 (2000), 481–499

[20] X.H. Hu and R.A. Nicolaides, Covolume techniques for anisotropic media. *Numer. Math.* 61 (1992), 215–234.

[21] P. A. Jayantha and Ian W. Turner, A Second Order Finite Volume Technique for Simulating Transport in Anisotropic Media", *The Int. J. of Num. Met. for Heat and Fluid Flow*, 13 (2003), 31–56.

[22] P. A. Jayantha and I. W. Turner, A Second Order Control-Volume Finite-Element Least-Squares Strategy for Simulating Diffusion in Strongly Anisotropic Media. *J.Comp. Math.*, 23 (2005), 1–16.

[23] D. Lamberton and B. Lapeyre, An Introduction to Stochastic Calculus Applied to Finance. *Chapman and Hall*, (1995).

[24] I.D. Mishev, Finite volume methods on Voronoï meshes. *Num. Meth. P.D.E.*, 14 (1998), 193–212.

[25] R.A. Nicolaides, Direct discretization of planar div-curl problems. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* , 29 (1992), 32–56.

[26] O. Touazi, Mise en oeuvre d'un schéma de volumes finis pour les équations de Navier-Stokes compressibles. *Thesis of Marne-la-Vallée university (France)*, in preparation (2007).

[27] M. Putti and C. Cordes Finite Element Approximation of the Diffusion Operator on Tetrahedra. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 19 (1998), 1154–1168.

[28] S. Wang, Solving convection-dominated anisotropic diffusion equations by an exponentially fitted finite volume method. *Comput. Math. Appl.* 44 (2002), 1249–1265.